97

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
071425 MAY 12 2008
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. (1)

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

BETTY TURNER

Petitioner

v.

PERRY COUNTY COAL CORPORATION
and
HOMER YOUNG

Respondents

On Petition For Writ Of Certiorari to the Kentucky Court of Appeals

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

JAMES E. KELLER
Counsel of Record
GESS MATTINGLY &
ATCHISON, P.S.C.
201 West Short Street
Lexington, KY 40507
Telephone (859)252-9000
Counsel for Petitioner

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether a state court may discriminate against an individual born out of wedlock by denying her the right to inherit from the paternal estate on the *sole* basis that her father died prior April 26, 1977, the date that this Court decided *Trimble v. Gordon*, 430 U.S. 762, 97 S.Ct. 1459, 52 L.Ed.2d 31 (1977)?[1]

---

[1] In *Trimble v. Gordon*, 430 U.S. 762, 97 S.Ct. 1459, 52 L.Ed.2d 31 (1977), this Court held that a total statutory disinheritance, from the paternal estate, of children born out of wedlock and not legitimated by the subsequent marriage of their parents is unconstitutional.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

QUESTIONS PRESENTED i

TABLE OF CONTENTS ii

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES iv

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI 1

OPINIONS BELOW 1

JURISDICTION 1

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND STATUTES INVOLVED 2

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 4

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION .. 7

I. The Kentucky Supreme Court's Adoption of a Prospective-Only Application of *Trimble* Conflicts with Prior Decisions of this Court 7

II. The Kentucky Supreme Court's Adoption of a Prospective-Only Application of *Trimble* Conflicts with Decisions of Other State Courts 11

CONCLUSION 14

APPENDIX 1a

Appendix A - Partial Summary Judgment of the Perry Circuit Court Entered on May 1, 2006 ..... 1a

Appendix B - Opinion of the Kentucky Court of Appeals Affirming the Judgment of the Perry Circuit Court Rendered on April 6, 2007 ..... 5a

Appendix C - Order of the Supreme Court of Kentucky Entered on February 13, 2008 and Denying Discretionary Review 12a

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES

Cases:

Reed v. Campbell, 476 U.S. 852, 106 S.Ct. 2234, 90 L.Ed.2d 858 (1986) .. 7, 9, 10

Trimble v. Gordon, 430 U.S. 762, 97 S.Ct. 1459, 52 L.Ed.2d 31 (1977) 7, 8

Pendleton v. Pendleton, 531 S.W.2d 507 (Ky. 1975), *vacated and remanded*, 431 U.S. 911 (1977) 8

Pendleton v. Pendleton, 560 S.W.2d 538 (Ky. 1978) 8

Harris v. Stewart, 981 S.W.2d 122 (Ky. 1998) 10

Marshall v. Marshall, 670 S.W.2d 213 (Tenn. 1984) 11

Williamson v. Gane, 176 W.Va. 443, 345 S.E.2d 318 (1986) 12

Mitchell v. Hardwick, 297 S.C. 48, 374 S.E.2d 681 (1988) 12

Ka'u Agribusiness Co., Inc. v. Heirs or Assigns of Ahulau, 105 Haw. 182, 95 P.3d 613 (2004) 13

Collier v. Shell Oil Co., 534 So.2d 1015 (Miss. 1988) 14

Henson v. Jarmon, 759 S.W.2d 368 (Tex. App. 1988) 14

Statutes:

Ky. Rev. Stat. § 391.090(2) (repealed 1986) .. 8

Ky. Rev. Stat. § 391.105 10

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner, Betty Turner, prays that a Writ of Certiorari issue to review the opinion of the Kentucky Court of Appeals rendered on April 6, 2007.

OPINIONS BELOW

The Perry Circuit Court of the Thirty-Third Judicial Circuit of Kentucky entered a partial summary judgment against Petitioner on May 1, 2006. The partial summary judgment of the Perry Circuit Court is unpublished but is reprinted in the Appendix at 1a. The Kentucky Court of Appeals subsequently entered an opinion on April 6, 2007 affirming the partial summary judgment of the Perry Circuit Court. The opinion of the Kentucky Court of Appeals is published as *Turner v. Perry County Coal Corporation*, 242 S.W.3d 658 (Ky. App. 2007) and is reprinted in the Appendix at 5a. Then, on February 13, 2008, the Kentucky Supreme Court entered an order on denying Petitioner's motion for discretionary review of the opinion of the Kentucky Court of Appeals. The order of the Kentucky Supreme Court is unpublished and is reprinted in the Appendix at 12a.

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of the Supreme Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND STATUTES INVOLVED

1. Section I of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

2. Kentucky Revised Statutes § 391.090(2) (repealed 1986) provided, in pertinent part, that "[a] bastard child shall inherit only from his mother and his mother's kindred."

3. Kentucky Revised Statutes § 391.105 provides, in pertinent part:

> (1) For the purpose of intestate succession, if a relationship of parent and child must be established to determine succession by, through, or from a person, a person born out of wedlock is a child of the natural mother. That person is also a child of the natural father if:
>
> (a) The natural parents participated in a marriage ceremony before or after the birth of the child, even though the attempted marriage

is void; or

(b) In determining the right of the child or its descendants to inherit from or through the father:

1. There has been an adjudication of paternity before the death of the father; or

2. There has been an adjudication of paternity after the death of the father based upon clear and convincing proof.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner, Betty Turner ("Turner"), was born out of wedlock on May 22, 1932 in Hazard, Perry County, Kentucky. She is the daughter of John B. "Buck" Combs, who was of "mixed" race, and Susie Coots, who was white. As a child, Turner was supported by her father but lived in a segregated society where she was unaccepted at the white school because she was too black and where she was unable to go to the black school because she was too white. Now, over thirty years after this Court decided *Trimble v. Gordon*, 430 U.S. 762, 97 S.Ct. 1459, 52 L.Ed.2d 31 (1977), the Kentucky Court of Appeals has denied Turner's right to inherit from her father on the sole basis that her father died prior to April 26, 1977, the date this Court decided *Trimble*.

The real property that is the subject of the decisions below and of Turner's claims (hereinafter the "Real Property") was acquired by John B. Combs by General Warranty Deed dated May 14, 1948. Located on Curley Fork of Browns Fork of Big Creek in Perry County, Kentucky, the Real Property remained solely owned by Mr. Combs until he died intestate on December 29, 1962. Subsequent to his death (and prior to 2004), there were no transfers of the Real Property and no lawsuits or other legal proceedings involving the Real Property. To the contrary, the Real Property sat idle and unoccupied for over forty years.

In the latter part of 2004 and prior to filing the underlying civil action in the Perry Circuit Court,

Respondent, Perry County Coal Corporation ("Perry County Coal"), began purchasing purported "interests" in the Real Property. The grantors of these purported interests were certain descendants of John B. Combs as identified in an Affidavit of Descent dated February 16, 1967 and of record in the Office of the Perry County Clerk. Noticeably absent from the Affidavit of Descent was any mention of Turner, the daughter and sole child of John B. Combs; however, it was at the time that Perry County Coal began acquiring purported interests in the Real Property that it first became aware of Turner's claim thereto.

Perry County Coal then instituted the circuit court action wherein it sought an adjudication of ownership to and partition of the Real Property. Because Perry County Coal was aware of Turner's claim to the Real Property, she, along with Respondent, Homer Young, and certain other relatives of John B. Combs were named as a defendants in the state court partition. After answering, Turner filed a counterclaim and cross-claim wherein she sought an adjudication that she is the owner of the Real Property by virtue of Kentucky's laws of descent and distribution.

The parties filed cross motions for summary judgment with the circuit court wherein they sought an adjudication of Turner's rights to the Real Property. After hearing, the circuit court entered a partial summary judgment on May 1, 2006 wherein it made three rulings. App. 2a-3a. First, the circuit court held that, based on clear, convincing, and undisputed proof, Turner is the daughter of John B.

Combs. App. 2a. Second, the circuit court held that Turner's claims for recovery of the Real Property were brought within the applicable fifteen-year statute of limitations. App. 2a-3a. Despite these findings, however, the circuit court also ruled that Turner's ownership claims to the Real Property were barred by the Kentucky Supreme Court's holding in *Pendleton v. Pendleton*, 560 S.W.2d 538 (Ky. 1978) (hereinafter *Pendleton II*). App. 3a.

In *Pendleton II*, the Kentucky Supreme Court held that Ky. Rev. Stat. § 391.090, which provided that "[a] bastard child shall inherit only from his mother and his mother's kindred," was invalid in light of this Court's holding in *Trimble*. Despite recognizing the invalidity of Ky. Rev. Stat. § 391.090, the Kentucky Supreme Court also held that its opinion "shall have no retroactive effect upon the devolution of any title occurring before April 26, 1977 (the date of the *Trimble* opinion), except for those specific instances in which the dispositive constitutional issue raised in [*Pendleton II*] was then in the process of litigation." *Pendleton II*, 560 S.W.2d at 539.

Turner then appealed to the Kentucky Court of Appeals, which on April 6, 2007 rendered an opinion affirming the judgment of the circuit court. Although recognizing that this Court applied *Trimble* retroactively in *Reed v. Campbell*, 476 U.S. 852, 106 S.Ct. 2234, 90 L.Ed.2d 858 (1986), the Kentucky Court of Appeals held that the rule announced by the Kentucky Supreme Court in *Pendleton II* was not changed by this Court in *Reed*.. App. 10a. Turner then filed a motion for discretionary review with the

Kentucky Supreme Court, which motion was denied by order entered February 13, 2008. App. 12a.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

By discriminating against Turner on the sole basis that her father died prior to April 26, 1977, the Kentucky Court of Appeals has decided an important federal constitutional question in a way that conflicts with this Court's decision in *Reed v. Campbell*, 476 U.S. 852, 106 S.Ct. 2234, 90 L.Ed.2d 858 (1986). Likewise, the decision of the Kentucky Court of Appeals conflicts with the decisions of other state courts of last resort that have examined the retroactive application of the *Trimble* decision.

I. The Kentucky Supreme Court's Adoption of a Prospective-Only Application of *Trimble* Conflicts with Prior Decisions of this Court.

In *Trimble*, this Court held that a total statutory disinheritance from the paternal estate of children born out of wedlock and not legitimized by the subsequent marriage of the parents runs afoul of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteen Amendment. *Trimble*, 430 U.S. at 776, 97 S.Ct. at 1468. The rationale was straightforward: the imposition of disabilities on the illegitimate child is contrary to the basic concept of our system that legal burdens should bear some relationship to individual responsibility or wrongdoing. *Id.* at 769-70, 97 S.Ct. at 1465 (citing *Weber v. Aetna Casualty & Surety Co.*, 406 U.S. 164,

175, 92 S.Ct. 1400, 1406, 31 L.Ed.2d 768 (1972)). While noting that an accurate and efficient method of disposing of property at death is an important state interest, this Court held that such an interest does not justify the complete exclusion of illegitimate children as their intestate fathers' heirs. *Id.* at 776, 97 S.Ct. at 1468.

Although *Trimble* involved an Illinois statute, the harsh common law rule under which an illegitimate child was *filius nullius* and incapable from inheriting from anyone was also evidenced in Ky. Rev. Stat. § 391.090 (repealed 1986), which stated that "[a] bastard child shall inherit only from his mother and his mother's kindred." Ky. Rev. Stat. § 391.090(2). Kentucky courts initially upheld the constitutionality of Ky. Rev. Stat. § 391.090. *Pendleton v. Pendleton*, 531 S.W.2d 507 (Ky. 1975), *vacated and remanded*, 431 U.S. 911, 97 S.Ct. 2164, 53 L.Ed.2d 220 (1977). But, on remand from this Court and in light of the *Trimble* holding, the Kentucky Supreme Court declared Ky. Rev. Stat. § 391.090 to be invalid. *Pendleton v. Pendleton*, 560 S.W.2d 538 (Ky. 1978) (*Pendleton II*). As set forth above, however, the Kentucky Supreme Court adopted a prospective application rule by holding that its "opinion shall have no retroactive effect upon the devolution of any title occurring before April 26, 1977 (the date of the Trimble opinion), except for those specific instances in which the dispositive constitutional issue raised in this case was then in the process of litigation." *Id.* at 539.

Nearly a decade after the *Trimble* decision, this

Court delivered its opinion in *Reed v. Campbell*, 476 U.S. 852, 106 S.Ct. 2234, 90 L.Ed.2d 858 (1986). In *Reed*, the appellant's father died intestate in Texas on December 22, 1976, some four months prior to this Court's decision in *Reed*. The Texas Court of Appeals had therefore held that § 42 of the Texas Probate Code, which prohibited an illegitimate child from inheriting from his or her father unless the parents had subsequently married, controlled. In other words, the Texas Court of Appeals, much like the Kentucky Supreme Court in *Pendleton II* and the Kentucky Court of Appeals in the opinion below gave *Trimble* prospective-only application. This Court ultimately reversed this judgment of the Texas Court of Appeals. *Reed*, 476 U.S. at 857, 106 S.Ct. at 2238.

Although recognizing that a state may assert special requirements upon an illegitimate child who asserts a right to inherit from his or her father, such as "applicable limitations on the time and the manner in which claims may be asserted," this Court held that Texas's interest in the orderly administration of the appellant's father's estate would have been served "equally well regardless of how the merits of the claim were resolved." *Id.* at 856, 106 S.Ct. at 2238. This Court thus held that the appellant's "interest in equal treatment protected by the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution–more specifically, the interest in avoiding unjustified discrimination against children born out of wedlock–should therefore have been given controlling effect." *Id.* (citations omitted).

Despite noting the holding in *Reed*, the Kentucky

Court of Appeals in the opinion below affirmed the prospective-only application of *Trimble* first adopted by the Kentucky Supreme Court in 1978 in *Pendleton II*. The opinion of the Kentucky Court of Appeals therefore conflicts with a prior decision of this Court.

Ironically, in light of *Trimble* and *Reed*, the Kentucky General Assembly amended Ky. Rev. Stat. § 391.105(b)(2) in 1988 to insure the orderly disposition of property at death and to assure the dependability of titles to property passing through intestacy. *See Harris v. Stewart*, 981 S.W.2d 122 (Ky. 1998). Such laws are entirely permissible provided that they bear a rational and substantial relationship to the furtherance of the legitimate state policies. *See Reed*, 476 U.S. at 855, 106 S.Ct. at 2237 (noting that a state legislature may enact laws imposing special requirements upon an illegitimate child who asserts a right to inherit from her father). And, Turner met all of the heightened requirements imposed by Kentucky statute.

But, by denying Turner's claims solely on the fact that her father died prior to the April 26, 1977, the Kentucky Court of Appeals has imposed discriminatory burdens on Turner beyond those contemplated by Ky. Rev. Stat. § 391.105. As recognized in *Reed*, a prospective-only application of *Trimble* bears no rational relationship to a state interest. By denying Turner's claims, the Kentucky Court of Appeals has violated the tenants of *Reed* and has affirmed Kentucky precedent that is directly at odds with longstanding constitutional jurisprudence of this Court.

II. The Kentucky Supreme Court's Adoption of a Prospective-Only Application of *Trimble* Conflicts with Decisions of Other State Courts.

After applying *Trimble* to invalidate their own similar statutes, other state courts addressing the prospective/retroactive application of *Trimble* have consistently recognized retroactivity. Some of these decisions recognizing the retroactive application of *Trimble* were decided before *Reed* and others were decided with the benefit of *Reed*, but none adopts an absolute bar to retroactive application such as the Kentucky courts have applied to deny Turner's claims.

For example, in *Marshall v. Marshall*, 670 S.W.2d 213 (Tenn. 1984), the Supreme Court of Tennessee recognized that "retrospective application of a decision overruling an earlier decision ordinarily is denied only if such an application would work a hardship upon those who have justifiably relied upon the old precedent." *Id.* at 215 (citations omitted). As such, the Supreme Court of Tennessee held that, since the parties had not relied upon old law and had passively acquired rights as the heirs at law of an intestate property owner, the rule announced in *Allen v. Harvey*, 568 S.W.2d 829 (Tenn. 1978) (holding that a child born out of wedlock could inherit from his intestate father provided that parent-child relationship was shown by clear and convincing evidence), could be applied retroactively.

The Supreme Court of Appeals for West Virginia expanded on this limited retroactivity rule in

Williamson v. Gane, 176 W.Va. 443, 345 S.E.2d 318 (1986). While recognizing that the principal reason for limiting the retrospective reach of *Trimble* is to prevent chaotic conditions concerning real property titles and acknowledging that such a consideration has a proper place in the retroactivity determination, the Supreme Court of Appeals of West Virginia nonetheless concluded that retroactivity may be extended "in a way that justly and fairly reconciles the constitutional interests in equality ... with reliance and finality interests." *Id.* at 320. As such, the court held that its decision in *Adkins v. McEldowney*, 167 W.Va. 469, 280 S.E.2d 231 (1981) (which invalidated a West Virginia statute similar to that involved in *Trimble*) should be given retroactive effect if any of the following conditions is met: (1) there has been no justifiable and detrimental reliance upon the pre-*Trimble* law; (2) the subject property has not been transferred to an innocent purchaser for value; or, (3) the estate administration is subject to further resolution. *Id.* at 322.

Likewise, in *Mitchell v. Hardwick*, 297 S.C. 48, 374 S.E.2d 681 (1988), the South Carolina Supreme Court adopted a rule of limited retroactivity. The court first recognized the major arguments against applying *Trimble* retroactively: (1) the denial of rights of those who detrimentally relied on old law; (2) the difficulty of proving paternity; and, (3) the disruption of the probate process. *Id.* at 682-83. And, in light of these concerns, the South Carolina Supreme Court held that limited retroactive application of *Trimble* is only appropriate when an innocent purchaser will not be adversely affected by

detrimental reliance on the old law, the paternity of the child has been conclusively established, and the estate administration is subject to further resolution. *Id.*

This approach was also adopted by the Supreme Court of Hawaii in *Ka'u Agribusiness Co., Inc. v. Heirs or Assigns of Ahulau*, 105 Haw. 182, 95 P.3d 613 (2004). Unlike the courts in the above-mentioned opinions, the Supreme Court of Hawaii was able to examine the retroactive application of *Trimble* with the benefit of this Court's decision in *Reed*. After a thorough analysis of the decisions of other states, the Supreme Court of Hawaii adopted the same three-prong test announced by the South Carolina Supreme Court in *Mitchell*. The court reasoned that the limited retroactive application of *Trimble* as adopted in *Mitchell* is appropriate because it addresses the concerns raised by this Court in both *Trimble* and *Reed*:

> In sum, the *Mitchell* test recognizes inheritance rights of "some significant categories of illegitimate children of intestate men ... without jeopardizing the orderly settlement of estates or the dependability of titles to property passing under intestacy laws," *Trimble*, 430 U.S. at 771, 97 S.Ct. 1459, and therefore it preserves the valid state interests at issue, *i.e.*, the "accurate and efficient disposition," *id.* at 777, 97 S.Ct. 1459, and "orderly and just distribution" of estates, *Reed*, 476 U.S. at 855, 106 S.Ct. 2234.

> Furthermore, its requirements provide "a more demanding standard," in the area of proof of paternity, as the Court advised in *Trimble*, 430 U.S. at 770, 97 S.Ct. 1459.

Ka'u Agribusiness Co., Inc., 105 Haw. at 192, 95 P.3d at 623. Other state courts have also retroactively applied *Trimble* in light of the *Reed* decision. *See, e.g., Collier v. Shell Oil Co.*, 534 So.2d 1015 (Miss. 1988); *Henson v. Jarmon*, 759 S.W.2d 368 (Tex. App. 1988).

While there are some differences among the tests for retroactivity announced in these decisions, they consistently recognize that a prospective-only application of *Trimble* is unconstitutional. This Court similarly refused to adopt a prospective-only approach in *Reed*. So, not only does the rule of law announced by the Kentucky Supreme Court in *Pendleton v. Pendleton*, 560 S.W.2d 538 (Ky. 1978) and applied by the Kentucky Court of Appeals in the opinion below ignore this Court's holding in *Reed*, but the prospective-only rule used to deny Turner's right to inherit from her father also ignores the well-reasoned opinions of numerous state courts of last resort.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, this Court should grant the Petition for Writ of Certiorari.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES E. KELLER
Counsel of Record
GESS MATTINGLY &
ATCHISON, P.S.C.
201 West Short Street
Lexington, KY 40507
Telephone (859) 252-9000
Counsel for Petitioner

May 12, 2008.

APPENDIX A

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
PERRY CIRCUIT COURT
CIVIL ACTION NO. 05-CI-00448

No. 02-5099

PERRY COUNTY COAL CORPORATION, Plaintiff

V.

HOMER YOUNG, ET AL., Defendants

[Entered: May 1, 2006]

PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

The above cause having come on for hearing on April 7, 2006, on the Motion for Partial Summary Judgment filed by Plaintiff, Perry County Coal Corporation, the Motion for Partial Summary Judgment filed by Defendant, Betty Turner, and the Motion for Partial Summary Judgment filed by Defendant, Homer Young, whereby each moving party sought entry of a Summary Judgment adjudicating the issues of whether Defendant, Betty Turner, is the child of John B. "Buck" Combs, and of whether Defendant, Betty Turner, has an interest in the subject real property by virtue of Kentucky's law

of intestate succession; there being no issue as to any material fact herein; and, the Court having reviewed the record and Memoranda of Law contained therein, heard statements of counsel, and being otherwise sufficiently advised on the basis of the record herein;

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED by the Court as follows:

(1) This Court has jurisdiction of the parties and the subject matter of this action.

(2) Based on the record herein, and the clear and convincing and undisputed proof contained therein, including the birth certificate of Betty Turner, the marriage license of Betty Turner, the deposition testimony of Betty Turner, and the deposition testimony of A.B. Olinger, the Defendant, Betty Turner, is the natural child of John B. "Buck" Combs.

(3) John B. "Buck" Combs died intestate on December 29, 1962. KRS 391.090 in effect on that date provided that a child born out of wedlock shall inherit only from his mother unless the father marries the mother and recognizes the child as his, in which case the child shall be deemed legitimate and shall inherit from his father. The mother of Betty Turner never married John B. "Buck" Combs.

(4) From the death of John B. "Buck" Combs on or about December 29,1962, until the conveyances of purported interests in the subject real property by the alleged heirs of John B. "Buck" Combs to

Plaintiff, Perry County Coal Corporation, in 2004, there were no legal actions concerning, conveyances of, or other ousters from the subject real property so that the claims of Defendants, Betty Turner and Homer Young, were timely brought within the fifteen-year statute of limitations for the recovery of real property set forth in KRS 413.010.

(5) Accordingly, although Defendant, Betty Turner, is the child of John B. "Buck" Combs, and her claims were brought within the limitations period set forth in KRS 413.010, her claims are barred by the holding in **Pendleton v Pendleton, 560 S.W. 2d 538 (Ky. 1978)** (hereinafter referred to as **Pendleton II**), wherein the Supreme Court of Kentucky adopted a prospective-only application rule for the holding of the Supreme Court of the United States in **Trimble v Gordon, 430 U.S. 762 (1977)** by holding that "its opinion shall have no retroactive effect upon the devolution of any title occurring before April 26, 1977 (the date of the Trimble opinion), except for those specific instances in which the dispositive constitutional issue raised in this case was then in the process of litigation." **Pendleton II at 539.**

(6) Partial Summary Judgment to the extent set forth herein is awarded at this time against Defendant, Betty Turner, and in favor of Plaintiff, Perry County Coal Corporation, and Defendant, Homer Young. Accordingly, the Counterclaim and Cross-claim of Defendant, Betty Turner, is dismissed.

(7) Pursuant to Civil Rule 54.02(1), there is no

just reason for delay, and this Partial Summary Judgment is a Final and Appealable Judgment.

(8) Pursuant to Civil Rule 77.04, the Clerk of this Court is hereby Ordered and directed to serve copies of this Partial Summary Judgment upon all of the parties to this action.

This the 1 day of May, 2006.

/s/ William Engle, III
WILLIAM ENGLE, III
JUDGE, PERRY CIRCUIT COURT

APPENDIX B

RENDERED: APRIL 6, 2007; 10:00 A.M.
TO BE PUBLISHED

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
COURT OF APPEALS

No. 2006-CA-001019-MR

BETTY TURNER, Appellant

v.

PERRY COUNTY COAL CORPORATION and
HOMER YOUNG, Appellees

Appeal from Perry Circuit Court
Honorable William Engle III, Judge
Action No. 05-CI-00448

OPINION AFFIRMING

BEFORE: LAMBERT AND STUMBO, JUDGES; BUCKINGHAM,[2] SENIOR JUDGE.

---

[1] Senior Judge David C. Buckingham sitting as Special Judge by assignment of Chief Justice pursuant to Section 110(5)(b) of the Kentucky Constitution and Kentucky Revised Statutes (KRS) 21.580. Harrison County Sheriff's Office.

BUCKINGHAM, SENIOR JUDGE: Betty Turner appeals from an order of the Perry Circuit Court granting Perry County Coal Corporation and Homer Young summary judgment on the issue of whether Turner has an ownership claim to real property located in Perry County, Kentucky. For the reasons below, we affirm.

Turner was born out of wedlock on May 22,1932, to Susie Coots. Her father was John B. "Buck" Combs. Combs and Coots never married, though Combs supported Turner as a child. In May 1948 Combs acquired property located on Curley Fork of Browns Fork of Big Creek in Perry County. He continued to own the property until his death on December 29, 1962. Combs died intestate and left no direct descendents other than Turner.

On February 16, 1967, Malvia Combs Young, Buck Combs's second cousin, executed and recorded an affidavit of descent for Combs. The affidavit identified various second and third cousins as intestate successors to the real property of Buck Combs, including the subject property. Thereafter, until 2004, there were no transfers or other proceedings involving the property.

In late 2004, Perry County Coal, relying on the 1967 affidavit of descent, purchased several undivided interests in the property. Having obtained such interests, on August 23, 2005, the coal company filed an action in Perry Circuit Court to partition the

property. Among the defendants named were Turner, whom the complaint identified as "may be claiming an interest in the property", and appellee Homer Young.

Turner filed an answer and counterclaim contending that she was the sole heir-at-law of Buck Combs and, accordingly, was the owner of the property. Replies to Turner's counterclaim by the coal company and Young denied Turner's assertion of title.[3]

The parties subsequently filed motions for summary judgment on the issues of whether Turner is the child of Buck Combs and whether Turner has an interest in the property by virtue of Kentucky's laws of intestate succession. On May 1,2006, the circuit court entered an order determining that Turner was the child of Buck Combs,[4] but that Turner had no claim to the property under the applicable laws of intestate succession. Turner thereafter appealed from the portion of the order that denied her claim to the property.

Summary judgment is proper where there exists no genuine issue of material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Kentucky Rule of Civil Procedure (CR) 56.03; *Steelvest, Inc. v. Scansteel Service Center, Inc.*, 807 S.W.2d 476 (Ky. 1991). Questions of law are reviewed de novo on

---

[2] In his answer and counterclaim to the original complaint, Young asserted sole ownership to the property by adverse possession.

[3] This issue is not now disputed.

appeal. *Gosney v. Glenn*, 163 S.W.3d 894, 898 (Ky.App. 2005). The relevant facts in this case are not in dispute, and the only issue before us is whether Turner has a claim to the subject property under the relevant Kentucky laws of intestate succession.

At the time of Buck Combs's death in 1962, Kentucky Revised Statute (KRS) 391.090(2) was in effect. It stated, in relevant part, that "[a] bastard shall inherit only from his mother and his mother's kindred." Because of this provision in Kentucky intestate succession laws, Buck Combs's property did not pass to Turner as it would today.

In *Trimble v. Gordon*, 430 U.S. 762, 97 S.Ct. 1459, 52 L.Ed.2d 31 (1977), the U.S. Supreme Court held that statutes, such as KRS 391.090(2), discriminating against illegitimate children were unconstitutional under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. In accordance with *Trimble*, in *Pendleton v. Pendleton*, 560 S.W.2d 538 (Ky. 1977)(*Pendleton II*), the Kentucky Supreme Court struck down KRS 391.090(2). In so doing, however, the court stated:

> Insofar as it declares the invalidity of KRS 391.090 this opinion shall have no retroactive effect upon the devolution of any title occurring before April 26, 1977 (the date of the Trimble opinion), except for those specific instances in which the dispositive constitutional issue raised in this case was then in the process of litigation.

560 S.W.2d at 539.

"It is a well known and established rule of law in

this jurisdiction that upon the death of a person intestate, title to his real estate immediately vests in his heirs at law[.]" *Rose v. Rose*, 296 Ky. 18, 22, 176 S.W.2d 122, 124 (1943). Thus, upon Buck Combs's death on December 29, 1962, the subject property passed to his heirs-at-law under the then-existing laws of intestate succession. Those heirs were identified in the May 1967 affidavit of descent filed by Malvia Combs Young. Because *Pendleton II* had "no retroactive effect upon the devolution of any title occurring before April 26,1977," its striking down of KRS 391.090(2) did not, and may not now, have an effect upon the title to the subject property.

Turner argues that, contrary to the aforementioned language in the *Pendleton II* case, the *Trimble* case applies retroactively. In support of this argument, she relies on *Reed v. Campbell*, 416 U.S. 852, 106 S.Ct. 2234, 90 L.Ed.2d 858 (1986). In that case, the illegitimate child's father died intestate in 1976, and an administratrix of his estate was appointed shortly thereafter. The *Trimble* case was decided by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1977, four months after the decedent's death. The Texas statute in effect at the time of the death prohibited an illegitimate child from inheriting from his or her father unless the parents had subsequently married. In February 1978, the illegitimate child notified the administratrix and the probate court of her claim. A formal civil action was filed shortly thereafter.

After finding that the claimant was the child of the decedent, the Texas courts rejected the claim on the grounds that *Trimble* did not apply retroactively. The U.S. Supreme Court reversed the Texas courts

and held that *Trimble* applied retroactively to the facts of the case. 476 U.S. at 857. However, the Court recognized that:

> [t]he state interest in the orderly disposition of decedents' estates may justify the imposition of special requirements upon an illegitimate child who asserts a right to inherit from her father, and, of course, it justifies the enforcement of generally applicable limitations on the time and the manner in which claims may be asserted. After an estate has been finally distributed, the interest in finality may provide an additional, valid justification for barring the belated assertion of claims, even though they may be meritorious and even though mistakes of law or fact may have occurred during the probate process.

Id. at 855-56.

The facts in this case are distinguishable from those in *Reed*. In *Reed*, the illegitimate child's claim was made while the estate remained open in the probate court. Here, the decedent had been dead for over 40 years.[5] In accordance with the aforementioned language in Reed, we conclude that the state's interest in finality provides justification for barring Turner's claim. In short, the rule stated by our supreme court in *Pendleton II* was not changed by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Reed*. *See*

---

[5] There was never any settlement of the estate of Buck Combs.

Pendleton v. Centre College of Kentucky, 818 S.W.2d 616, 619 (Ky.App. 1990)(*Pendleton III*). Thus, the circuit court properly awarded summary judgment against Turner.

The judgment of the Perry Circuit Court is affirmed.

ALL CONCUR.

APPENDIX C

SUPREME COURT OF KENTUCKY

2007-SC-0309-D
(2006-CA-1019)

BETTY TURNER, MOVANT

V.

PERRY COUNTY COAL CORPORATION and
HOMER YOUNG, RESPONDENTS

Perry Circuit Court
No. 2005-CI-0448

ORDER

The motion for review of the decision of the Court of Appeals is denied.

ENTERED February 13, 2008.

/s/ Joseph E. Lambert
CHIEF JUSTICE